



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/002,062	10/30/2001	Shell S. Simpson	10007669-1	8476

7590 06/12/2006

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

POWERS, WILLIAM S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2134

DATE MAILED: 06/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>		<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/002,062		SIMPSON ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>		<b>Art Unit</b>	
	William S. Powers		2134	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 April 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 October 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Amendment***

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-10, 12-16 and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,721,908 to Lagarde et al. (hereinafter Lagarde) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,151,675 to Smith in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,134,325 to Vanstone et al. (hereinafter Vanstone).

Regarding claims 1 and 12, Lagarde teaches:

- a. A browser to access a Web service and download content (column 9, lines 10-11; column 10, lines 16-20)
- b. Retrieving image data under the control of said browser (column 5, lines 16-24).

Art Unit: 2134

Lagarde uses password authorizations and obtaining "information from confidential source[s]" (column 10, lines 53-56), but does not, specifically, disclose the use of public/private encryption, encrypting data, transmitting of said encrypted data or decrypting said encrypted data. However, in an analogous art, Smith teaches:

- c. Downloading the public key from the server, encrypts the data, transmits said encrypted data to said server and said server decrypts said data using private key counterpart to said public key (Smith, column 6, lines 27-39) in order to effect secure document delivery.

Smith does not expressly mention that the public key is downloaded from the intended recipient. However, in an analogous art, Vanstone teaches downloading of the public key of the recipient to the sender so that the sender can transmit data encrypted with the public key of the recipient to the recipient (Vanstone, column 2, lines 46-53 and column 3, lines 1-14).

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the invention of Lagarde with the security features disclosed by Smith and Vanstone to ensure secure data transmission to the web service and the transfer of the recipient's public key from the recipient to the sender in order that the data remains secure and can only be decrypted by the recipient with the private key counterpart to the downloaded public key (Vanstone, column 1, lines 7-14).

Regarding claims 2 and 13, Lagarde as modified teaches said retrieved data is associated with user's identity (Lagarde, column 5, lines 13-24).

Regarding claims 3 and 14, Lagarde as modified discloses the destination web service represents a production device (Lagarde, column 15, lines 15-22).

Regarding claims 4 and 19, Lagarde as modified discloses the production device is a printer (Lagarde, column 15, lines 15-22).

Regarding claim 5, Lagarde as modified discloses a method whereby the web service has restricted access to user's data (Lagarde, column 12, lines 29-39).

Regarding claim 6, Lagarde as modified does not disclose a hard disk. However, Official Notice is given that it is well known that modern computer systems employ hard disks as secondary memory.

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Lagarde as modified using a hard disk for secondary memory.

Regarding claim 7, Lagarde as modified discloses various document forms including BMP and GIF files, but PDF is not mentioned, specifically (Lagarde, column 17-18, lines 56-67 and 1-3). However, Smith teaches, by way of example, securely transmitting a PDF file over the network (Smith, column 5, lines 46-56).

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the invention of Lagarde with the PDF format document disclosed by Smith.

Regarding claims 8 and 15, Lagarde as modified discloses options presented by the destination web service for the user to choose according to his/her needs (Lagarde, column 10, lines 37-41).

Regarding claims 9 and 16, Lagarde as modified discloses printing and/or producing results of the user's options (Lagarde, column 15, lines 15-22).

Regarding claim 10, Lagarde as modified discloses printing reports reflecting user's desired options (Lagarde, column 14, line 62-column 15, line 32).

Regarding claim 18, Lagarde as modified teaches:

- a. A user's browser operable to encrypt image data using a first encryption key as part of the encryption process (Smith, column 6, lines 27-39).
- b. Transmitting said encrypted data image (Smith, column 6, lines 27-39).
- c. A destination web service representing a production device (Lagarde, column 15, lines 15-22).
- d. Said web service operable to download said first encryption key into said user's browser (Vanstone, column 2, lines 46-53 and column 3, lines 1-14).

Art Unit: 2134

- e. Said web service operable to receive said transmitted encrypted image data and to decrypt said received image data using a private encryption key counterpart of said first encryption key (Smith, column 6, lines 27-39).
- f. A data path interconnection said user's browser with said destination web service (Lagarde, column 9, lines 18-26).

Regarding claim 20, Lagarde as modified discloses hard wired and wireless data paths (Lagarde, column 9, lines 18-26).

Regarding claim 21, Lagarde as modified teaches said first encryption key is a public encryption key (Smith, column 4, lines 45-51).

2. Claims 11, 17 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,721,908 to Lagarde et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,151,675 to Smith in further view of Applied Cryptography by Bruce Schneier.

Lagarde as modified teaches security measures, but does not, specifically, disclose the use of a session key. However, in an analogous art, Schneier teaches "a hybrid cryptosystem" (page 33, 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph) wherein a session key is generated that encrypts the data, uses the public key to encrypt the session key and sends the session key and data to the destination where the private key counterpart decrypts the session key and the session key decrypts the data (page 33, paragraphs 6-9) in order to more effectively use the computer system resources.

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to institute the session key encryption scheme, as disclosed by Schneier, as this better utilizes computer resources.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed 4/19/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

The Examiner, respectfully, disagrees with the argument that there is no motivation to combine the Smith and Vanstone patents. The invention of Smith is directed to the secure delivery of documents between a sender and recipient (Smith, column 1, lines 5-10), as is the invention of Vanstone (Vanstone, column 3, lines 1-14). Smith achieves this by encrypting the document with the public key of the server associated with the intended recipient. The server decrypts the document with the private key and transmits the decrypted document to the recipient inside the firewall or



phone are unsuccessful, the examiner's  
called on 571 272 6962. The fax phone  
tion or proceeding is assigned is 571-

application may be obtained from the  
) system. Status information for  
either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.  
is available through Private PAIR only.  
see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should  
AIR system, contact the Electronic  
ree). If you would like assistance from a  
access to the automated information  
DA) or 571-272-1000.

*Jaime R. Lopez*  
JAMES H. LOPEZ  
REGISTERED PATENT ATTORNEY

re-encrypts the document with the public k  
re-encrypted document to the recipient. Th  
of the intended recipient to encrypt data at  
public key of the intended recipient to encr  
does not teach away from using the public  
just uses it at a different transmission poin

**Cor**

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** A  
policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for re  
MONTHS from the mailing date of this ac  
TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this  
mailed until after the end of the THREE-M  
shortened statutory period will expire on t  
extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(  
the advisory action. In no event, howeve  
than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date

Any inquiry concerning this comm  
examiner should be directed to William S  
8573. The examiner can normally be rea